

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Applicants have carefully considered the Final Office Action issued December 30, 2003 in the above-titled matter. Claims 1-13, 16-18 and 22-43 are pending.

Claims 1, 17, 18, 24 and 28 have been amended to more clearly recite the invention. No new matter has been added.

Support for the claim amendment can be found throughout the specification. For example, the specification discloses a rule-based query at page 11, line 17 and a finite state process at page 12, line 4.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 10-13, 17, 18, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carbonell et al (WO 94/06086) in view of Trados Translator's Workbench for Windows. Applicant traverses.

Claim 1, as amended, recites identifying an element as a source placeable element by predetermined criteria based on the content of the element according to a rule-based query. Claim 17 recites wherein the element identifier identifies an element as a source placeable element by predetermined criteria based on the content of the element according to a rule-based query. Claim 18 recites an element identifier identifying placeable elements by a predetermined criteria based on the content of the elements according to a rule-based query. Claim 24 recites identifying a source placeable element by predetermined criteria based on the content of the source placeable element according to a rule-based query. Neither Carbonell nor Trados teaches or suggests a rule-based

query. Therefore, claims 1, 17, 18, and 24 are allowable. The rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 5, 7, 8, and 10-13 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 1.

Claims 2-4, 6 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carbonell in view of Trados and further in view of Murrow (EPO 0668558). Applicant traverses.

Claims 2-4, 6 and 9 depend from claim 1. As noted above, Carbonell and Trados, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest claim 1. Murrow does not make up for the deficiencies of Carbonell and Trados. Murrow merely discloses localization of a computer program but fails to teach or suggest predetermined criteria based on the element according to a rule-based query. Therefore claims 2-4, 6 and 9 are allowable. The rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being inpatentable over Carbonell in view of Trados and further in view of Beauregard (US Pat. No. 5,974,413). Applicant traverses.

Claim 22 and 23 depend from claim 1. As noted above, Carbonell and Trados, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest claim 1. Beauregard fails to make up for the deficiencies of Carbonell and/or Trados. Beauregard merely discloses currency conversion and date transformation but fails to each or suggest predetermined criteria based on the element according to a rule-based query. Therefore, claims 22 and 23 are allowable. The rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 15-24 were rejected "under the same rationale" as claims 1-13 and 16. Claims 15, 19-21 have been canceled. Claims 16 and 22-23 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 1. Claims 17, 18, 22 and 23 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 25-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carbonell in view of Ravin (U.S. Pat. No. 5,819,265). Applicants traverse.

Claim 25, as amended, recites identifying an element as a source placeable element by predetermined criteria based on the element according to a finite state process, said finite state process comprising examining each character of a token to obtain a determination that the identified element is a source placeable element. Claim 39, as amended, recites the element identifier identifies an element as a source placeable element by predetermined criteria based on the element according to a finite state process, said finite state process comprising examining each character of a token to obtain a determination that the element is a source placeable element. Claim 40, as amended recites an element identifier identifying placeable elements by a predetermined criteria based on the elements according to a finite state process, said finite state process comprising examining each character of a token to obtain a determination that the elements are placeable elements. Claim 43, as amended, recites identifying a source placeable element by predetermined criteria based on the source placeable element according to a finite state process, said finite state process comprising examining each character of a token to obtain a determination that an element is a source placeable element.

Serial Number 09/071,900


Atty Docket No: 4832.00022

Neither Carbonell nor Ravin, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest predetermined criteria based on the source placeable element according to a finite state process. Therefore, claims 25, 39, 40, and 43 are allowable. The rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 26-38, 41 and 42 depend from claim 25 and are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 25.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance are respectfully requested. If the Examiner feels that a telephone interview would be helpful in facilitating prosecution of the case, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney of record to discuss the application.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
C.R.G. 48303
Christopher R. Glembocki
Registration No. 38,800

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1001 G Street, N.W., 11th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 508-9100

Dated: February 6, 2004